

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

PILLSBURY COMPANY CENTENNIAL

✓ President
ATWOODRobert Keith
Mrs E. Nicholas HarrisCoca Cola
"INSTITUTION IN CRISIS: A REASONED RESPONSE"

EMORY UNIVERSITY

FEBRUARY 3, 1970

*I want to talk about our Country! What's it like?
How are we doing?*

In 50 years, America has grown from a nation of
 scattered towns and villages to a great urban civilization;
 from a nation cut off from the turmoil of the outside
world to the most powerful and involved nation on earth.

Our economy now produces almost a trillion dollars a year
 and unparalleled prosperity for most of our people.

We have faced crisis, both here and abroad; ~~we~~
 have seen the central purpose of our nation embrace major
 responsibility for world order in the most uncertain age in
 modern history; and we have seen our domestic issues
change and grow in pace with America herself — from an
economy on the brink of ruin to one of colossal strength that
 now must cope with a problem of pollution -- a direct by-product
 of our unmatched standard of living.

Indeed, revolutionary changes in the economy, communications, transport, and our way of life itself have called into question all that we once believed to be firm and unchanging ~~from our~~ *all the way from our* security as Fortress America to our confidence that we could do anything with a bit of luck and pluck.

Many of these revolutionary changes we did not *anticipate or expect* and some we still cannot fully understand. The increase of violence alone in the past decade has produced a groundswell of unease throughout the nation. The impact of efforts to redistribute income -- through the war on poverty and through the struggle for equal education and job opportunities -- is only now beginning to point to a redistribution of political power in the nation.

These changes compel us to be concerned and committed in our efforts to master the future of our nation. They force us to cross-examine the way our institutions actually work, *and*

-3-

and to question what has happened to the individual in our society. ^{And} ~~And~~ ^{and} ~~above~~ ^{and} ~~all~~ ^{and} ~~these~~ ^{and} ~~changes~~ ^{and} ~~compel~~ ^{and} ~~us~~ ^{and} ~~to~~ ^{and} ~~define~~ ^{and} ~~our~~ ^{and} ~~goals~~ ^{and} ~~with~~ ^{and} ~~an~~ ^{and} ~~urgency~~ ^{and} ~~seldom~~ ^{and} ~~seen~~ ^{and} ~~in~~ ^{and} ~~American~~ ^{and} ~~history.~~

∠ I am not calling for an American retreat from the world-- however much we may scale down our foreign involvements.

∠ We cannot withdraw into a new isolationism. (The traditional line dividing domestic from foreign affairs has become as indistinct as a line drawn through water. (This means that our place in the world and the nature of our ^{own} society have become indivisible -- ~~and that~~ ^{to} our structure of common defense ~~and security~~ ^{and security} ~~the world~~ could prove to be only a hard outer shell that could collapse on an empty center unless we bring new strength to areas of our internal life that are questioned on every side.

But, If we are to play a role in the world that will contribute to peace and security, we must re-examine the values that we live by and undertake those internal reforms that will make the future work for us. ∠ We must build a new strategy of democracy. !!

In my first lecture in Minneapolis, I called for the development of this new democratic strategy -- a method to help us meet and master the most critical threats to our free society and even to mankind's very existence: the threat of nuclear weapons; the destruction of our physical environment; and forces of technological progress that can as easily enslave man as set him free.

Tonight, ~~I want to be more specific.~~ I want to deal with three basic and irreducible elements of that strategy which -- if combined with strong, thoughtful leadership -- may give us the tools we need to shape the uncertain future to our will.

↳ The three elements of this strategy are:

First, a commitment to rational thought as a method for comprehending the world;

Second, the use of this rational method to understand what is happening to our democratic institutions; and

Third, the setting of goals and priorities for our nation,

and the constant commitment to base them firmly on human values.

oh yes I know -
This strategy may seem commonplace -- a set of the
cliches of society and politics. But that is precisely my point!

Today, this method should be commonplace, and yet it is not.

Too often we find ourselves drifting into a process of rhetoric
that is devoid of reason; we ignore the evidence of our senses
concerning the changes that are taking place around us; or
we fail to order the way in which we set out to control and develop
the world in which we all have to live. The new strategy of
democracy is a call -- a commitment -- to the use of our common
sense in this due process of mastering the future.

We must begin with a basic and uncompromising
commitment to the full use of our powers of intelligence. We
face a greater need for hard analysis and clear vision than at
any time in our past. Yet rarely has there been so much
ostrich-like ignoring of critical problems around us.

Or, when we do open our eyes, our vision is clouded with
dangerous over-simplifications, or corrupted into despair
because of a lack of historical perspective. *Some would argue,*
 Perhaps our world
 has become too complex for us to understand -- though I
doubt it. *Some would say,*
 Perhaps we cannot make the needed changes, or
 they have come too late to serve us -- though I believe we
can prevail.

↳ We now see about us the politics of impotence; a
 politics in which the noisy, helpless venting of frustration
 too often replaces the harder and often quieter effort to work
~~through~~ *out* our existing problems; a politics in which self-styled
purity of thought or emotion seems more important than
commitment to constructive action; a politics in which the
lessons of the past are often ignored in the search for immediacy.

↳ Throughout American history we have suffered
 successive waves of this anti-intellectualism -- this
rejection of history -- times when a man's use of his mind to

question the world has been considered subversive, or times when we have simply lost the necessary balance between reason and passion. / Today this challenge to rational thought and historical perspective is a double one; it comes not only from the apostles of the status quo, but also from many who profess a desire to change America for the better, yet lack the patience or the courage to undertake the hard intellectual effort that is essential for success. / We have been subjected to a form of politics by decibel count, in which volume and not reason is considered the test of truth. / Worse still, we now witness a politics of silence, in which leaders of our nation summon unspoken fears to justify inaction or retreat, and to stifle dissent.

/ Of course, hard, cold logic on its own is never enough -- no man ever succeeded in separating his thoughts from his beliefs, and still managed to live a whole life that included concern for his neighbor.

∠ Indeed, we have too often failed to make the political and moral decisions that would keep our intellectual tools related to man's needs. ∠ Nuclear weapons of mass destruction and the pollution of our lakes and rivers are just as much a product of the rational age as the great developments in health, transport, space, and communications.

∠ I welcome the new unwillingness of our most thoughtful people to accept sterile intellectualism that is divorced from passion or belief. ∠ But unfortunately, the pendulum is swinging too far; the attacks on these abuses of the intellectual process are often corrupted into a blind indictment of the process itself.

∠ We must oppose this narrow emotionalism, whenever and wherever it appears. ∠ We must re-examine each old and new political slogan -- from the simplistic cries of 'peace now' to the shrill demand for 'law 'n order.' Are they reasonable?

Are they right? We must also break out of the prison of unconstructive opposition, in which we condemn the old simply because it is not new. As John Stuart Mill warned:

"The unwise are those who bring nothing constructive to the process and who greatly imperil the future of mankind, by leaving great questions to be fought out between ignorant change on the one hand, and ignorant opposition to change, on the other."

This, then, is the first element of the new strategy of democracy: our great nation of action must now also become a great nation of thought. The purpose of knowledge is action. Knowledge without commitment is wasteful. But commitment with knowledge is dangerous.

There must be a second element in this new strategy.

It is not enough to preserve the tools of thought and action,
We must use these tools to understand the full meaning and
impact of the changes that are turning the world upside down,

↳ It is now painfully clear that many -- if not all -- of
our established political, economic, and social institutions are
caught in a dangerous and possibly deadly crossfire of
conflicting values. ↳ The family, religion, our sense of
community -- all seem to provide less stability than they did
even a generation ago. ↳ There is less certainty about the
role of our more formal institutions, as well -- the economy,
government in Washington and in our states and cities,
universities, the rule of law, and the democratic process
itself. ↳ This is more than a generation gap or a temporary
disagreement about the best way to achieve common goals.
↳ The goals themselves are in question; there is little
agreement on what we should be doing as a nation; worse
still, there appears to be no clear way of reaching agreement.

~~We are~~

There is a growing sense of feeling
 powerless - overwhelmed by
 our own Creation - unable to
 affect the ~~device~~ control or even
 affect the decisions that govern
 our lives. Everything seems
 "Giant size" - too big - too powerful -
 and even too remote from our
 touch or influence. ~~Government~~
~~is big, impersonal, complex,~~
~~and Business and Labor are~~
 Then too, there is the frustration
 of Idealism. The anger, dissent,
 and Violence which characterizes
 our time, is not ^{so much} a rejection
 of our ideals - ~~that~~ it is
 the feeling that we have
 failed to live by them.

✓ In the United States we developed a set of democratic institutions, from the American public school to republican government, which have helped bring us through the ravages of civil war, economic crisis, world war, and the radical changes of the industrial era. ✓ But, it is no longer adequate to argue that democracy will be preserved simply by keeping these institutions intact -- by pretending that we have nothing new to learn about the fundamental social, economic, or political requirements of democratic man in the last third of the 20th century. ✓ Democracy is a method, not a rigid code of behavior; and our democratic institutions must truly serve the needs of people -- all people -- or fail. In other words, they must reform or perish.

✓ The problems confronting our institutions are not limited to America. But they have become more acute here, partly because of the rapid pace of our own economic development, and partly because of our idealism.

2 The true greatness of America has never been our massive size, or our economic and military power, or even the qualities that we Americans have developed as a people. Instead, the greatness of America -- and its continuing challenge -- is our opportunity to work out some ^{of the} universal aspirations of mankind. If we fail, we fail greatly; but if we succeed, we offer hope to men everywhere.

The American Revolution was ~~begun~~ ^{fought} to protect the individual and the community against illegitimate demands made by the state. 2 We tried then to build safeguards into our political institutions that would prevent the community ~~and individuals~~ from ~~once again~~ being threatened by an autocratic and unrepresentative government. 2 But, the American Revolution is a continuing one: representative government requires an ever-expanding base of consent. Bureaucratic rules can easily become autocratic edicts. Government that is too remote from the people may serve no one at all.

L The Revolution of 1776 did not banish injustice, it merely gave each new generation the opportunity -- and the challenge -- to do so, ~~And our generation surely has its work to do.~~

Today, many of our institutions have come to act at cross-purposes with the simple truths on which this nation was founded: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

L Americans, young and old, who point this out -- and who would do something about it, not through violence and intolerance, but within the framework of democracy -- are the true protectors of our nation. They, as well as ~~those~~ ~~people~~ who wish to preserve what is best in our tradition, are carrying forward the never-ending work of democracy.

As the President of Princeton University, Robert Goheen, has written:

"...thoughtful indignation is the spirit that pierces self-deception, that is not satisfied with things as they are, that seeks always to render them better -- or, at least, better understood.

L "It accepts the necessity of sacrifice and hard
work this side of Eden, and it is closely related
 to the spirit of freedom under whose institutions
 the readiness to question, to explore change, and
 to seek a better way can flourish, As such,
 the true spirit of discontent is one of the
strongest and most creative forces working
 for civilization, for human dignity."

L Americans acting in this spirit reflect the best
 traditions of our country. We must listen to them, and work
 to reconcile two streams of thought and action: we must
 create the synthesis that will permit change, but also
 preserve the values that imbue change with meaning and
 direction.

* * * * *

L This will require a third element in the new
 strategy of democracy -- one based on the total commitment of
 our powers of intelligence -- ~~to help us understand the~~
~~dynamic processes of change.~~

*The setting of goals and
 priorities and the constant commitment
 to base them firmly on human values.*

-15-

We must make choices and choose wisely.

~~L We must set goals and priorities for our nation that will
 enable us to use our understanding in the most
 profitable way -- to lead our efforts to a broadening of
 our fundamental notions of liberty. L We must choose, and
 choose wisely. *always seeking to broaden the*~~

L We know that our population will increase by
 100 million by the year 2000. But what is to be our
 program for health, education, housing, employment,
 and social services.

L We know that the major problem of the last third
 of this century will be the growth and development of
 our cities. *But* What is our program for the city of today

and tomorrow? *How will they be financed - How many
 new cities - and where?*

L We are a nation concerned with tars and nicotine
 in cigarettes -- but what will we do to control pollution
 of air and water?

∟ We are a nation that has carried medical science to the point of organ transplants. ∟ But what will we do to provide health services to all our people at a price they can afford to pay?

∟ And we are a nation that has developed computers to direct a man to the moon. But, how will we use these same devices to make better decisions that will serve human needs on earth?

∟ This is what it means to choose wisely. ?

∟ For the first time in our history, except for the temporary crises of war or depression, we now face the need to plan for our future. ∟ No corporation could succeed without a clear understanding of its goals, objectives, and the means of achieving them. ∟ Our country cannot afford to be without them either. ∟ We must now put "first things first," and choose from among the array of attractive, but competing, alternatives. ∟ Buying guns means having less butter, even in a country as rich as ours.

Plan

L The diversion of resources to heavy military commitments
 tends to shape the structure of the economy: will our
 schools turn out engineers or teachers? Will industry
 concentrate on gadgetry or on health research? And the
control of pollution -- our new pressing task -- may involve
 some short-term economic costs even as it provides long-
 term human benefits. What will we choose? Will we be willing to
 pay the price in order to have clean air and water? Will we
 make sacrifices today in order to eliminate poverty, tomorrow?

Will we ~~and~~ accelerate the fight against disease, ignorance, and
 urban blight? *even if it means cutting back on other matters or*
 Indeed, are we ready to answer these questions *Paying more in taxes.*
 at all? *—H*

L In transportation, for example, we have spent billions
 on highways, but little or nothing on mass transit. In
 New York City recently, bus and subway fares were raised
 by 50%. This misguided step: ----

-18-

-- taxes the poor subway rider and subsidizes the more affluent suburban motorist;

-- encourages more people to bring cars into an already overcrowded city;

-- threatens a choking city with even more pollution; and

-- makes nonsense of all our political rhetoric about commitment to priorities.

↳ We cannot continue to be privately rich and publicly poor. It is now clear that some things that add to the comfort of the few must be given up for the benefit of

the many. But, if we make no conscious, enlightened choices, we not only degrade the world we live in, but also increase the social and economic divisions in our country. And we watch the goal of a free, prosperous, cooperative people slip even farther from our grasp.

← Keep

Someone has to represent the future. Only we can do it; and we must do it now! *Keep*

So, How do we proceed? How can we search for priorities without corrupting this search into a laundry-listing of programs or into arguments about statistics that have little relation to real people? How can we provide business and labor with national goals that will help them to plan responsibly for the future? How can we relate what is possible at every point with the basic, human values that alone can give meaning to all of our efforts?

This is not primarily a task for government, although it has most often been left to the bureaucratic and legislative institutions, with their narrow purview and parochial interests. Ideally, the setting of priorities should involve *as* many institutions, interest groups, and individuals as possible -- beginning in our nation's universities.

- ↳ National goals have no reality if they are merely the recitation of bureaucratic choices made in Washington.
- ↳ They must command the broad-based political support that can translate them into specific action.

↳ The setting of goals is the easier part of the job. ~~There must also be~~ ^{It is the} careful planning of the thousands of tactical details that will give meaning to this broad strategy of choices, and ~~that~~ will permit flexibility and individual initiative within the framework of national goals. We have decisions to make about the use of talent, money, and other scarce resources.

This work must not become an arid retailing of facts and figures, or the production of more long and tedious studies. ↳ It must be a thoughtful and continuing analysis of this nation's strengths, weaknesses, and fundamental beliefs.

It must bring to bear techniques and resources that are now scattered in a dozen different directions. The problems of the cities, for example, demand responses that deal simultaneously with all the elements of the urban environment. This has long been possible. *we have done it in Defense space* Our method thus far, however, has been a fragmented and piecemeal gesture that has usually led to more conflicts of priorities and haphazard development. "Urban renewal" has become a synonym for good intentions gone wrong, not because we could not do better, but because we were unwilling to look and plan far enough ahead, to keep a critical eye on all the parts of the puzzle, and to accept the fact that not all parties in the resulting compromise will be happy with the results.

In eight years, we landed two men on the moon because we made a political commitment and then directed the human and economic resources where and when they were needed.

L This can -- and must -- be done in our domestic economy,
to fulfill ~~our~~ other national goals. ~~The cities present a~~
~~more complex problem than getting to the moon, with~~
~~many human factors to be considered.~~ But we can succeed,
provided we realize that making hard economic choices
and committing ourselves to national goals will not alone
~~meet our needs.~~ *but,* We must assure that these goals take
account of the many human factors -- that they serve
human ends.

Keep.

L Here, a great institution -- our trillion-dollar
economy -- is under attack. L Many Americans are making
an articulate and forceful challenge to materialism. L Yet,
to many other Americans, this challenge seems to be
making a mockery of their efforts to create and secure
homes and futures for their families.

L My generation went through the Great Depression.
we witnessed the collapse of our economic system. We
saw millions of men unemployed. Banks failed; mortgages
were foreclosed; there was widespread hunger and hardship
unknown in our history. L We were told that our economy
would never recover, that our dreams of prosperity would
never come true.

L Fortunately, these predictions were wrong, ~~but~~
those of us who lived through that time resolved that
the American people would never again suffer an economic
~~collapse~~ depression, or even a serious recession. L We were
concerned with jobs, production, consumption, and the
strengthening of those institutions that would give all
of us -- business, labor, and the common man -- a new
confidence in the ability of our economy to meet our wants
and needs.

~~The Power to Set Economic
Priorities based solely on the
Profit motive is just as
Corrupting of our democratic
institutions~~

Perhaps, in the process of creating this strong, productive economy, we were less mindful of the new and radically different problems that ~~our~~ success itself would bring ~~—~~ unmindful that wealth and prosperity would themselves prove insufficient if they were not used to bring spiritual worth and meaning into men's lives.

~~Today, we congratulate ourselves on an economy of massive size and strength, but we must listen to the voices that remind us that this achievement, however great, is not enough.~~

Keep

We are learning that the impersonal workings of an economic system ^{alone} do not produce a richer, fuller life, ~~but only ever-increasing demand for physical possessions and material goods.~~

Our challenge is to live up to our ideals and work for a sense of moral purpose instead of a second ^{or third} automobile:

to make what we are more important than what we have!

↳ The message is not to abandon or destroy our economic system, but rather to make the system serve both economic and social goals.

(Pause)

↳ ~~For millions of Americans, the role of our public institutions in providing and securing economic opportunity is still its chief function. For them, the New Deal has yet to be completed. But today, we know that this is not enough.~~

Keep

HP ~~As part of the new strategy of democracy,~~
government must ~~now~~ act to assure that the choices made within the economy serve human needs; that growth is tempered with equity.

~~For example, where industry will not stop polluting our environment to the point of threatening the future of life itself,~~ government must act to protect the public.

↳ When safety standards in automobiles or health standards in drugs are ignored, government, through the due process of law, must enforce them.

Where the impersonal system of manipulating consumer tastes threatens our health and sanity, then government must call a halt. Competition within industry can be turned to the benefit of the consumer. But, where it fails, government must take the lead.

What is the real difference between the man who produces and the man who consumes? Little indeed! each of us is a consumer; each of us is threatened by the physical poverty of a polluted world and most of us by the moral poverty of an undigested affluence. We must all work together then to bend our economic system to serve human needs, or we shall all suffer together. rising GN:P is little consolation to a person with falling pride or failing health.

But government should not impose its own choices according to some inflexible master plan. Such would be more threatening and insidious than today's worst excesses.

WHAT WE NEED IS A WHOLE RANGE OF NEW SEMI-PUBLIC
INSTITUTIONS, IN WHICH INDIVIDUALS WILL HAVE A GREATER
OPPORTUNITY TO BRING THEIR INTERESTS AND NEEDS TO BEAR IN
DECISIONS WHICH PROFOUNDLY AFFECT THEM. AMONG THESE WE
CAN CREATE A NEW, INDEPENDENT OFFICE IN THE FEDERAL
GOVERNMENT, EACH STATE CAPITAL, AND IN OUR LARGER CITIES -
THE OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN. OMBUDSMAN - THE OMBUDSMAN WOULD BE "THE
PEOPLE'S MAN" REPRESENTING THE INTERESTS OF INDIVIDUALS
AGAINST ABUSES OF BUREAUCRATIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE POWER.

IN ADDITION WE CAN ^{or must} REFORM AND STRENGTHEN EXISTING
INSTITUTIONS, BEGINNING WITH THE FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSIONS
WHICH ~~WERE~~ ^{WERE} INTENDED TO SERVE ALL OF US BUT, WHICH NOW TOO OFTEN
OVERLY REPRESENT THE CORPORATE INTEREST. WE CAN AND MUST
DEMAND THAT THE PUBLIC INTEREST BE PARAMOUNT. For example, THERE CAN AND
SHOULD BE A COUNCIL OF CONSUMER ADVISORS TO COORDINATE ALL
CONSUMER PROTECTION ACTIVITIES, TO REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT,
THE CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE ON THE STATE OF THE CONSUMER.

THIS COUNCIL WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSURING EFFECTIVE STANDARDS
FOR DRUGS AND CARS, FOOD AND FABRICS, ADVERTISING AND CREDIT AS
WELL AS RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAMS THAT BETTER SERVE THE PUBLIC.

GOVERNMENT TO BE EFFECTIVE MUST KEEP PACE WITH THE CHANGES
IN THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE ~~FOR WHICH GOVERNMENT WAS~~
~~DESIGNED TO SERVE.~~

WE MUST REFORM THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN WASHINGTON,
IN OUR STATE CAPITALS, AND IN OUR CITIES AND TOWNS. CAN WE DENY
THAT CONGRESS IS UNRESPONSIVE TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST, WHEN IT

TAKES SEVENTEEN YEARS TO PASS MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED, OR WHEN *programs*
Designed to Provide ~~PROVIDING~~ ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND ENDING POVERTY TAKE SECOND *ABM*
PLACE TO PILING ON MORE COSTLY WEAPONS OF WAR? *HEU.* CAN WE DENY

THAT STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE OFTEN FAILED TO PROVIDE
GOOD SCHOOLS OR TO GIVE PEOPLE A SENSE THAT THEIR NEEDS ARE
BEING MET? THESE ARE ISSUES AFFECTING PEOPLE AND PRIORITIES.

THEY RAISE BASIC QUESTIONS ABOUT ~~THE~~ REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS
AND THEIR CAPACITY TO HELP US ACHIEVE REFORM THROUGH DEMOCRATIC
PROCESSES.

LEGISLATURES AND CONGRESS HAVE FAILED TO PROPERLY
EQUIP THEMSELVES WITH ADEQUATE PROFESSIONAL STAFF AND MODERN
INFORMATION RETREVIAl SYSTEMS. THERE IS AN IMMEDIATE NEED
FOR A SYSTEM OF INFORMATION BANKS - ALL COMPUTER OPERATED, TO
GATHER, COLLATE, INDEX AND COORDINATE THE EVER EXPANDING FLOOD
OF SOCIAL, SCIENTIFIC AND ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DATA.

GOVERNMENT CANNOT COPE WITH THE COMPLEXITY OF TODAYS PROBLEMS,
WITH THE TOOLS OF YESTERDAY. THE RAPID PACE OF CHANGE, TRIGGERED
IN PART BY THE INFORMATION EXPLOSION AND THE REVOLUTION IN
COMMUNICATIONS, DEMANDS NEW TECHNIQUES IN THE USE OF KNOWLEDGE,
INFORMATION AND DATA BANKS - USING THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS
IN INFORMATION SCIENCE MUST BE STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE
FOR MODERN GOVERNMENT, AND, then

IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT THERE IS A NEED
OF CONTINUOUS REEXAMINATION OF ORGANIZATION, DIRECTED TOWARD
ACHIEVING A MORE RAPID RESPONSE TO CURRENT PROBLEMS AND A
SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO LONG RANGE PLANNING. HERE AGAIN WE
NEED INNOVATION. I PROPOSE A COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISORS
ATTACHED TO THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT SIMILAR TO THE PRESENT
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISORS. JUST AS THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC
ADVISORS SEEKS TO INFORM AND ADVISE THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS
ON ALL ECONOMIC MATTERS INCLUDING TRENDS AND FORECASTS, SO THE
COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISORS WOULD ADVISE AND
INFORM THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS ON ALL SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL
MATTERS INCLUDING SUCH ITEMS AS HOUSING, HEALTH, EDUCATION, CIVIL
RIGHTS, CRIME AND DISORDER, WELFARE AND POVERTY. THIS SAME STRUCTURE

IS NEEDED AT EVERY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT.

L STATE CONSTITUTIONS, CITY CHARTERS AND STRUCTURES OF
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ARE IN ALL TOO MANY INSTANCES OUT-MODED
AND CRIPPLED BY ARCHIAC PROCEDURES.

L STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ORIENTED TO A SOCIETY THAT
WAS PRIMARILY RURAL HAVE LOST THEIR CAPACITY TO GOVERN IN THE
HIGHLY URBANIZED, INDUSTRIALIZED SOCIETY OF TODAY, THE TIME IS
LONG OVER-DUE FOR BASIC STRUCTURAL REFORM OR WE SHALL WASTE OUR
RESOURCES IN A FUTILE EFFORT. L THE NEEDS OF TOMORROW WILL NOT
BE SATISFIED BY JUST A MASSIVE INJECTION OF NEW MONEY INTO OLD
AND OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS. ~~W~~ WAST IN-PUTS OF MONEY
AND RESOURCES REQUIRE A GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE THAT IS CAPABLE
OF MANAGING AND DIRECTING THESE RESOURCES.

~~and we must~~
~~more important, we must better understand the~~
~~nature of power in our society.~~

~~ALTERNATE:~~

THE POLITICAL PROCESS, STARTING WITH THE POLITICAL PARTIES, DEMANDS REFORM AND UP-DATING, INCLUDING BROADENING THE BASE OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION, IMPROVING THE METHOD OF DELEGATE SELECTION AND MODERNIZING THE ^{rules and procedures} ~~POLITICAL CONVENTION~~ ^{of the Party Convention.} ~~AND RULES AND PROCEDURES.~~ THE NOMINATION OF A PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE A RESULT OF A PROCESS THAT IS UNREPRESENTATIVE, UNDEMOCRATIC, OR UNFAIR. IF THE NOMINATING CONVENTION SYSTEM IS TO SURVIVE THERE MUST BE CHANGES. IT IS either REFORM OR PERISH!! OUR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT SHOULD BE ELECTED BY A DIRECT POPULAR VOTE. MODERN COMMUNICATIONS MAKES THIS POSSIBLE AND NECESSARY. FOR THOSE MILITANTS WHO SEEK TO ABOLISH A COLLEGE, I SUGGEST THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE. A SECOND CHANGE IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS IS THE PROGRAM OF NATIONAL REGISTRATION FOR ALL ELIGIBLE VOTERS - NO TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION IS GOOD SOLID AMERICAN DOCTRINE. THE SAME GOVERNMENT THAT IS ABLE TO REGISTER US FOR THE PURPOSE OF TAXATION CAN REGISTER US FOR THE PURPOSE OF ELECTIONS. AND, FINALLY, WE MUST CHANGE - YES, CLEAN UP, THE METHOD OF FINANCING POLITICAL PARTIES. THE PRESENT SYSTEM LENDS ITSELF TO SPECIAL

privilege, suspicion, and corruption. The funds for political parties can be obtained through a choice of direct appropriations from the treasury, a tax credit, or a deduction for tax purposes.,

Reform is essential.

*It can make Politics the plaything
for the rich and the tool
of the already too powerful.*

and, we must better understand the nature of Power in our society.

↳ We have tended to shy away from the fact that economic and political power — ~~that, the whole fabric of our social institutions and man's relation to them~~ — are firmly interlocked. ~~↳ Too often~~ We have accepted the assumption that every man has equal say in our democratic institutions, regardless of his economic or social status. ↳ We have denied that an uneven distribution of economic opportunity — who goes to college; — who gets the job in the high-income profession -- affects a man's chances to exercise leadership and power.

↳ We have been content to leave this understanding of the links between political and economic power to the ideologists of the left, or to the reactionaries of the right.

~~Such political immaturity is intolerable.~~ But now we must face this unpalatable truth. Unless we

understand and master these links, we will see a further limitation of personal choice, and a grave threat to any semblance of democratic process.

~~The signs of the times tell us - Reform or perish -~~

The Political Process, starting with the
 Political Parties, demands reform and updating,
~~including~~ including broadening the base of political
 Participation, improving the method of delegate
 selection, ~~for the purpose of~~ ^{and} modernizing the
 Political Convention rules and procedures.
 The nomination of a president and vice president
 is too important to be ~~the result of~~ ^{the result of} ~~an~~
~~unrepresentative and~~ process that
 is unrepresentative, undemocratic, and
 unfair. ~~The present system of the~~
 nominating Convention system
 is to survive & there must be
 changes - ~~the~~ It is Reform or Perish!
~~Thank to the~~ Our President & Vice President
 should be elected by direct popular
 vote. Modern Communication makes this
 possible and necessary. For those militants
 who seek to abolish ~~the~~ a college, I
 suggest the Electoral College. A second change
~~reform~~ in the political process, is
 the program of National Registration for
 all eligible voters - No taxation is without
 representation is good solid American doctrine.
 The same government that is able to register us
 for purposes of taxation can register us for
 the purpose of elections. And, finally,
 we must change - Yes, clean up. The

The power to set economic priorities based solely on the profit motive is just as corrupting of our democratic institutions as would be the installation of unelected leaders that has marked most of man's political history.

Keep

2 This is what is demanded of us, to examine these critical interrelationships of power in our society; to rethink fearlessly the nature of American society, government, and the economy; and to cast aside obsolete, restricting attitudes. It is this open-minded approach to our beliefs, our values, our problems, that will give us a method -- a new strategy of democracy -- to carry us into the new decade.

The signs are clear and demanding - Reform or Perish.

The decade that has just ended -- the 1960's -- was a time of dissent, discord, and division in our society. We have been subjected to stresses and strains that few nations before us have managed to survive.

method of financing Political Parties.
The Present system lends itself to special
Privileges, Suspicion, and Corruption.
~~Political control~~ The funds for Political
Parties can be obtained through a
check of direct appropriation from
~~public~~ the Treasury, a tax credit, or
a deduction for tax purposes.

001383

and We are not finished; there is more to endure before we succeed in turning rancour into reason, and frustration into fulfillment.

But this was also a decade of discovery:

-- in science, from the exploration of space to the conquering of disease; and

-- in economics, which brought us nearer than before to the secret of continuing growth and prosperity.

We also discovered our weaknesses:

-- the tragic face of poverty; and

-- the ugly face of racism.

— The Pale face of malnutrition and hunger.
We discovered that we are no longer a rural society,

but an unplanned, overcrowded, industrialized and urbanized society.

But above all, in this decade, we made new discoveries of the human spirit. In the darkest period of unrest in our nation since the Civil War, we discovered that we could find ways to live together;

that we could awaken the conscience of America, ~~to begin~~
~~during our social ills~~; and that we could experience a rebirth
of unselfishness, sharing, and community.

As we begin the new decade there is a profound
sense throughout America of weariness with struggle
and turmoil. But we are also carrying into the 1970's
a greater confidence in ourselves, ~~than we have known~~
~~before~~.

Keep
Keep
-- a confidence, not in impersonal institutions or in
remote processes of government, but rather in our ability
as individuals to overcome frustrations, barriers to social
progress, and the personal isolation that too often
accompanies urban growth. This is, above all, a spiritual
development, a greater maturity in outlook and action, and
a deeper sense of the importance and possibilities of
individual integrity.

This is the decade in which we Americans, as a people, can come of age.

Those same problems which divided us during the 1960's can become in the 1970's a basis for a new unity of purpose, a new sense that all of us share a common destiny. **L** We are united by the need to prevent nuclear war; the destruction of our environment; or our defeat by an impersonal and unregulated technology. But we are united even more by our growing awareness that we share the same human condition:

-- racial discord of the 1960's is compelling us to find, together, ways to transform this into racial harmony **A -**

-- the dissent of a new generation of Americans is bringing us to a better understanding of the values and beliefs that have always been the real strength of America; and

-- the divisions in our society growing out of poverty, deprivation, ^{hunger,} and inequality have made us aware that all of us must work together, or none of us will ^{can long} prosper.

This is the legacy of ^{of our} discovery.

This is what gives us hope; this is what gives us the moral strength and the spiritual courage to face an uncertain future -- not without difficulties and differences of opinion, but with a sense of common purpose, ~~confidence~~ and understanding that we can prevail.

This purpose and understanding ^{is} ~~are~~ the hallmark of the democratic strategy, that give us confidence that democracy can serve man's needs in the 1970's and beyond. As Reinhold Niebuhr said:

"Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."

#

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

PILLSBURY COMPANY CENTENNIAL

"INSTITUTION IN CRISIS: A REASONED RESPONSE"

EMORY UNIVERSITY

FEBRUARY 3, 1970

I want to talk about our country! What's it like? How are we doing?

In 50 years, America has grown from a nation of scattered towns and villages to a great urban civilization; from a nation cut off from the turmoil of the outside world to the most powerful and involved nation on earth. Our economy now produces almost a trillion dollars a year and unparalleled prosperity for most of our people.

We have faced crisis, both here and abroad; we have seen the central purpose of our nation embrace major responsibility for world order in the most uncertain age in modern history; and we have seen our domestic issues change and grow in pace with America herself -- from an economy on the brink of ruin to one of colossal strength that now must cope with a problem of pollution -- a direct by-product of our unmatched standard of living. Indeed, revolutionary changes in the economy, communications, transport, and our way of life itself have called into question all that

we once believed to be firm and unchanging all the way from our security as Fortress America to our confidence that we could do anything with a bit of luck and pluck.

Many of these revolutionary changes we did not anticipate or expect, and some we still cannot fully understand. The increase of violence alone in the past decade has produced a groundswell of unease throughout the nation. The impact of efforts to redistribute income -- through the war on poverty and through the struggle for equal education and job opportunities -- is only now beginning to point to a redistribution of political power in the nation.

These changes compel us to be concerned and committed in our efforts to master the future of our nation. They force us to cross-examine the way our institutions actually work and to question what has happened to the individual in our society. Above all, these changes compel us to define our goals and priorities with an urgency seldom seen in American history.

I am not calling for an American retreat from the world -- however much we may scale down our foreign involvements. We cannot withdraw into a new isolationism. The traditional line dividing domestic from foreign affairs has become as indistinct as a line drawn through water. This means that our place in the world and the nature of our own society have become indivisible.

Our structure of common defense and security could prove to be only a hard outer shell that could collapse on an empty center unless we bring new strength to areas of our internal life that are questioned on every side.

But if we are to play a role in the world that will contribute to peace and security, we must re-examine the values that we live by and undertake those internal reforms that will make the future work for us. We must build a new strategy of democracy!

In my first lecture in Minneapolis, I called for the development of this new democratic strategy -- a method to help us meet and master the most critical threats to our free society and even to mankind's very existence: the threat of nuclear weapons; the destruction of our physical environment; and forces of technological progress that can as easily enslave man as set him free.

Tonight, I want to deal with three basic and irreducible elements of that strategy which -- if combined with strong, thoughtful leadership -- may give us the tools we need to shape the uncertain future to our will.

The three elements of this strategy are:

First, a commitment to rational thought as a method for comprehending the world;

Second, the use of this rational method to understand what is happening to our democratic institutions; and

Third, the setting of goals and priorities for our nation, and the constant commitment to base them firmly on human values.

Oh yes, I know this strategy may seem commonplace -- a set of the cliches of society and politics. But that is precisely my point! Today, this method should be commonplace, and yet it is not. Too often we find ourselves drifting into a process of rhetoric that is devoid of reason; we ignore the evidence of our senses concerning the changes that are taking place around us; or we fail to order the way in which we set out to control and develop the world in which we all have to live. The new strategy of democracy is a call -- a commitment -- to the use of our common sense in this due process of mastering the future.

We must begin with a basic and uncompromising commitment to the full use of our powers of intelligence. We face a greater need for hard analysis and clear vision than at any time in our past. Yet rarely has there been so much ostrich-like ignoring of critical problems around us. Or, when we do open our eyes, our vision is clouded with dangerous over-simplifications, or corrupted into despair because of a lack of historical perspective. Some would argue, perhaps our world has become too complex for us to understand --

though I doubt it. Some would say, perhaps we cannot make the needed changes, or they have come too late to serve us -- though I believe we can prevail.

We now see about us the politics of impotence: a politics in which the noisy, helpless venting of frustration too often replaces the harder and often quieter effort to work out our existing problems; a politics in which self-styled purity of thought or emotion seems more important than commitment to constructive action; a politics in which the lessons of the past are often ignored in the search for immediacy.

Throughout American history we have suffered successive waves of this anti-intellectualism -- this rejection of history -- times when a man's use of his mind to question the world has been considered subversive, or times when we have simply lost the necessary balance between reason and passion. Today this challenge to rational thought and historical perspective is a double one: it comes not only from the apostles of the status quo, but also from many who profess a desire to change America for the better, yet lack the patience or the courage to undertake the hard intellectual effort that is essential for success. We have been subjected to a form of politics by decibel count, in which volume and not reason is considered the test of truth. Worse still, we now witness a politics of silence, in which leaders of our nation summon unspoken fears to justify inaction or retreat, and to stifle dissent.

Of course, hard, cold logic on its own is never enough -- no man ever succeeded in separating his thoughts from his beliefs, and still managed to live a whole life that included concern for his neighbor. Indeed, we have too often failed to make the political and moral decisions that would keep our intellectual tools related to man's needs. Nuclear weapons of mass destruction and the pollution of our lakes and rivers are just as much a product of the rational age as the great developments in health, transport, space, and communications.

I welcome the new unwillingness of our most thoughtful people to accept sterile intellectualism that is divorced from passion or belief. But, unfortunately, the pendulum is swinging too far; the attacks on these abuses of the intellectual process are often corrupted into a blind indictment of the process itself.

We must oppose this narrow emotionalism, whenever and wherever it appears. We must re-examine each old and new political slogan -- from the simplistic cries of "peace now" to the shrill demand for "law 'n order." Are they reasonable? Are they right? We must also break out of the prison of unconstructive opposition, in which we condemn the old simply because it is not new.

As John Stuart Mill warned:

"The unwise are those who bring nothing constructive to the process and who greatly imperil the future of mankind, by leaving great questions to be fought out between ignorant change on the one hand, and ignorant opposition to change on the other."

This, then, is the first element of the new strategy of democracy: our great nation of action must now also become a great nation of thought. The purpose of knowledge is action. Knowledge without commitment is wasteful. But commitment with knowledge is dangerous.

There must be a second element in this new strategy. It is not enough to preserve the tools of thought and action. We must use these tools to understand the full meaning and impact of the changes that are turning the world upside down.

It is now painfully clear that many -- if not all -- of our established political, economic, and social institutions are caught in a dangerous and possibly deadly crossfire of conflicting values. The family, religion, our sense of community -- all seem to provide less stability than they did even a generation ago. There is less certainty about the role of our more formal institutions, as well -- the economy, government in Washington and in our states and cities, universities, the rule of law, and the democratic process itself.

This is more than a generation gap or a temporary disagreement about the best way to achieve common goals. The goals themselves are in question; there is little agreement on what we should be doing as a nation; worse still, there appears to be no clear way of reaching agreement.

In the United States we developed a set of democratic institutions, from the American public school to republican government, which have helped bring us through the ravages of civil war, economic crisis, world war, and the radical changes of the industrial era. But it is no longer adequate to argue that democracy will be preserved simply by keeping these institutions intact -- by pretending that we have nothing new to learn about the fundamental social, economic, or political requirements of democratic man in the last third of the 20th century. Democracy is a method, not a rigid code of behavior; and our democratic institutions must truly serve the needs of people -- all people -- or fail. In other words, they must reform or perish.

The problems confronting our institutions are not limited to America. But they have become more acute here, partly because of the rapid pace of our own economic development, and partly because of our idealism.

There is a growing sense of feeling powerless -- overwhelmed by our own creation -- unable to control or even affect the decisions that govern our lives. Everything seems "giant size" -- too big -- too powerful -- and even too remote from our touch or influence. Then too, there is the frustration of idealism. The anger, dissent, and violence which characterizes our time is not so much a rejection of our ideals -- as it is the feeling that we have failed to live by them.

The true greatness of America has never been our massive size, or our economic and military power, or even the qualities that we Americans have developed as a people. Instead, the greatness of America -- and its continuing challenge -- is our opportunity to work out some of the universal aspirations of mankind. If we fail, we fail greatly; but if we succeed, we offer hope to men everywhere.

The American Revolution was fought to protect the individual and the community against illegitimate demands made by the state. We tried then to build safeguards into our political institutions that would prevent the community and individual from being threatened by an autocratic and unrepresentative government. But the American Revolution is a continuing one: representative government requires an ever-expanding base of consent.

Bureaucratic rules can easily become autocratic edicts.

Government that is too remote from the people may serve no one at all. The Revolution of 1776 did not banish injustice, it merely gave each new generation the opportunity -- and the challenge -- to do so.

Today, many of our institutions have come to act at cross-purposes with the simple truths on which this nation was founded: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Americans, young and old, who point this out -- and who would do something about it, not through violence and intolerance, but within the framework of democracy -- are the true protectors of our nation. They, as well as those who wish to preserve what is best in our tradition, are carrying forward the never-ending work of democracy.

As the President of Princeton University, Robert Goheen, has written:

"...thoughtful indignation is the spirit that pierces self-deception, that is not satisfied with things as they are, that seeks always to render them better -- or, at least, better understood. It accepts the necessity of sacrifice and hard work this side of Eden, and it is closely related to the spirit of freedom under whose institutions the readiness to question, to explore change, and to seek a better way can flourish.

"As such, the true spirit of discontent is one of the strongest and most creative forces working for civilization, for human dignity."

Americans acting in this spirit reflect the best traditions of our country. We must listen to them, and work to reconcile two streams of thought and action: we must create the synthesis that will permit change, but also preserve the values that imbue change with meaning and direction.

This will require a third element in the new strategy of democracy -- one based on the total commitment of our powers of intelligence -- the setting of goals and priorities and the constant commitment to base them firmly on human values. We must make choices and choose wisely.

We know that our population will increase by 100 million by the year 2000. But what is to be our program for health, education, housing, employment, and social services.

We know that the major problem of the last third of this century will be the growth and development of our cities. But what is our program for the city of today and tomorrow? How will they be financed -- how many new cities -- and where?

We are a nation concerned with tars and nicotine in cigarettes -- but what will we do to control pollution of air and water?

We are a nation that has carried medical science to the point of organ transplants. But what will we do to provide health services to all our people at a price they can afford to pay?

And we are a nation that has developed computers to direct a man to the moon. But how will we use these same devices to make better decisions that will serve human needs on earth?

This is what it means to choose wisely.

For the first time in our history, except for the temporary crises of war or depression, we now face the need to plan for our future. No corporation could succeed without a clear understanding of its goals, objectives, and the means of achieving them. Our country cannot afford to be without them either. We must now put "first things first," and choose from among the array of attractive, but competing, alternatives. Buying guns means having less butter, even in a country as rich as ours. The diversion of resources to heavy military commitments tends to shape the structure of the economy: will our schools turn out engineers or teachers? Will industry concentrate on gadgetry or on health research? And the control of pollution -- our new pressing task -- may involve some short-term economic costs even as it provides long-term human benefits. What will we choose?

Will we be willing to pay the price in order to have clean air and water? Will we make sacrifices today in order to eliminate poverty tomorrow? Will we accelerate the fight against disease, ignorance, and urban blight even if it means cutting back on other matters or paying more in taxes? Indeed, are we ready to answer these questions at all?

In transportation, for example, we have spent billions on highways, but little or nothing on mass transit. In New York City recently, bus and subway fares were raised by 50%. This misguided step:

- taxes the poor subway rider and subsidizes the more affluent suburban motorist;
- encourages more people to bring cars into an already overcrowded city;
- threatens a choking city with even more pollution; and
- makes nonsense of all our political rhetoric about commitment to priorities.

We cannot continue to be privately rich and publicly poor. It is now clear that some things that add to the comfort of the few must be given up for the benefit of the many. But, if we make no conscious, enlightened choices, we not only degrade the world we live in, but also increase the social and economic divisions in our country.

And we watch the goal of a free, prosperous, cooperative people slip even farther from our grasp. Someone has to represent the future. Only we can do it; and we must do it now!

So, how do we proceed? How can we search for priorities without corrupting this search into a laundry-listing of programs or into arguments about statistics that have little relation to real people? How can we provide business and labor with national goals that will help them to plan responsibly for the future? How can we relate what is possible at every point with the basic, human values that alone can give meaning to all of our efforts?

This is not primarily a task for government, although it has most often been left to the bureaucratic and legislative institutions, with their narrow purview and parochial interests. Ideally, the setting of priorities should involve as many institutions, interest groups, and individuals as possible -- beginning in our nation's universities. National goals have no reality if they are merely the recitation of bureaucratic choices made in Washington. They must command the broad-based political support that can translate them into specific action.

The setting of goals is the easier part of the job. It is the careful planning of the thousands of tactical details that will give meaning to this broad strategy of choices, and will permit flexibility and individual initiative within the framework of national goals. We have decisions to make about the use of talent, money, and other scarce resources.

This work must not become an arid retailing of facts and figures, or the production of more long and tedious studies. It must be a thoughtful and continuing analysis of this nation's strengths, weaknesses, and fundamental beliefs. It must bring to bear techniques and resources that are now scattered in a dozen different directions. The problems of the cities, for example, demand responses that deal simultaneously with all the elements of the urban environment. This has long been possible. We have done it in defense and space.

Our method thus far, however, has been a fragmented and piecemeal gesture that has usually led to more conflicts of priorities and haphazard development. "Urban renewal" has become a synonym for good intentions gone wrong, not because we could not do better, but because we were unwilling to look and plan far enough ahead, to keep a critical eye on all the parts of the puzzle, and to accept the fact that not all parties in the resulting compromise will be happy with the results.

In eight years, we landed two men on the moon because we made a political commitment and then directed the human and economic resources where and when they were needed. This can -- and must -- be done in our domestic economy, to fulfill other national goals. The cities present a more complex problem than getting to the moon, with many human factors to be considered. But we can succeed, provided we realize that making hard economic choices and committing ourselves to national goals will not alone meet our needs. But we must assure that these goals take account of the many human factors -- that they serve human ends.

Here, a great institution -- our trillion-dollar economy -- is under attack. Many Americans are making an articulate and forceful challenge to materialism. Yet, to many other Americans, this challenge seems to be making a mockery of their efforts to create and secure homes and futures for their families.

My generation went through the Great Depression. We witnessed the collapse of our economic system. We saw millions of men unemployed. Banks failed; mortgages were foreclosed; there was widespread hunger and hardship unknown in our history. We were told that our economy would never recover, that our dreams of prosperity would never come true.

Fortunately, these predictions were wrong. Those of us who lived through that time resolved that the American people would never again suffer an economic collapse. We were concerned with jobs, production, consumption, and the strengthening of those institutions that would give all of us -- business, labor, and the common man -- a new confidence in the ability of our economy to meet our wants and needs.

Perhaps, in the process of creating this strong, productive economy, we were less mindful of the new and radically different problems that success itself would bring -- unmindful that wealth and prosperity would themselves prove insufficient if they were not used to bring spiritual worth and meaning into men's lives. Today, we congratulate ourselves on an economy of massive size and strength, but we must listen to the voices that remind us that this achievement, however great, is not enough.

We are learning that the impersonal workings of an economic system alone do not produce a richer, fuller life.

Our challenge is to live up to our ideals and work for a sense of moral purpose instead of a second or third automobile: to make what we are more important than what we have! The message is not to abandon or destroy our economic system, but rather to make the system serve both economic and social goals.

For millions of Americans, the role of our public institutions in providing and securing economic opportunity is still its chief function. For them, the New Deal has yet to be completed. But today, we know that this is not enough. As part of the new strategy of democracy, government must act to assure that the choices made within the economy serve human needs; that growth is tempered with equity.

Where industry will not stop polluting our environment, government must act to protect the public. When safety standards in automobiles or health standards in drugs are ignored, government, through the due process of law, must enforce them. Where the impersonal system of manipulating consumer tastes threatens our health and sanity, then government must call a halt. Competition within industry can be turned to the benefit of the consumer. But, where it fails, government must take the lead.

What is the real difference between the man who produces and the man who consumes? Little indeed: each of us is a consumer; each of us is threatened by the physical poverty of a polluted world and most of us by the moral poverty of an undigested affluence. We must all work together then to bend our economic system to serve human needs, or we shall all suffer together. A rising GNP is little consolation to a person with falling pride or failing health.

But government should not impose its own choices according to some inflexible master plan. Such would be more threatening and insidious than today's worst excesses.

What we need is a whole range of new semi-public institutions, in which individuals will have a greater opportunity to bring their interests and needs to bear in decisions which profoundly affect them. Among these, we can create a new, independent office in the Federal government, each state capital, and in our larger cities -- the Office of Omsbudsman. The Omsbudsman would be "the people's man" representing the interests of individuals against abuses of bureaucratic and administrative power.

In addition, we can and must reform and strengthen existing institutions, beginning with the Federal regulatory commissions which were intended to serve all of us, but which now too often overly represent the corporate interest. We can and must demand that the public interest be paramount.

For example, there can and should be a Council of Consumer Advisors to coordinate all consumer protection activities; to report to the President, the Congress, and the people on the "state of the consumer." This council would be responsible for assuring effective standards for drugs and cars, food and fabrics, advertising and credit as well as radio and television programs that better serve the public.

Government to be effective must keep pace with the changes in the economic and social structure.

We must reform the legislative process in Washington, in our state capitals, and in our cities and towns. Can we deny that Congress is unresponsive to the public interest, when it takes 17 years to pass medical care for the aged, or when programs designed to provide economic opportunity and ending poverty take second place to piling on more costly weapons of war? Can we deny that state and local governments have often failed to provide good schools or to give people a sense that their needs are being met? These are issues affecting people and priorities. They raise basic questions about representative institutions and their capacity to help us achieve reform through democratic processes.

Legislatures and Congress have failed to properly equip themselves with adequate professional staff and modern information retrieval systems. There is an immediate need for a system of information banks -- all computer operated, to gather, collate, index and coordinate the ever expanding flood of social, scientific, and economic and political data. Government cannot cope with the complexity of today's problems, with the tools of yesterday. The rapid pace of change, triggered in part by the information explosion and the revolution in communications, demands new techniques in the use of knowledge.

Information and data banks -- using the latest developments in information science must be standard operating procedure for modern government.

And then, in the Executive Branch of government, there is a need of continuous re-examination of organization, directed toward achieving a more rapid response to current problems and a systematic approach to long-range planning. Here again we need innovation.

I propose a Council of Social Advisors attached to the Office of President similar to the present Council of Economic Advisors. Just as the Council of Economic Advisors seeks to inform and advise the President and the Congress on all economic matters, including trends and forecasts, so the Council of Social Advisors would advise and inform the President and Congress on all social and environmental matters, including such items as housing, health, education, civil rights, crime and disorder, welfare and poverty. And this same structure is needed at every level of government.

State constitutions, city charters, and structures of state and local government are in all too many instances outmoded and crippled by archaic procedures.

State and local government oriented to a society that was primarily rural have lost their capacity to govern in the highly urbanized, industrialized society of today.

The time is long overdue for basic structural reform or we shall waste our resources in a futile effort. The needs of tomorrow will not be satisfied by just a massive injection of new money into old and obsolete government institutions. Vast in-puts of money and resources require a governmental structure that is capable of managing and directing these resources.

The political process, starting with the political parties, demands reform and updating, including broadening the base of political participation, improving the method of delegate selection, and modernizing the rules and procedures of the Party Convention. The nomination of a President and Vice President is too important to be a result of a process that is unrepresentative, undemocratic, or unfair. If the nominating convention system is to survive, there must be changes. It is either reform or perish! Our President and Vice President should be elected by a direct popular vote. Modern communications makes this possible and necessary. For those militants who seek to abolish a college, I suggest the Electoral College.

A second change in the political process is the program of national registration for all eligible voters -- no taxation without representation is good solid American doctrine. The same government that is able to register us for the purpose of taxation can register us for the purpose of elections.

And, finally, we must change -- yes, clean up -- the method of financing political parties. The present system lends itself to special privilege, suspicion, and corruption. It can make politics the plaything for the rich and the tool of the already too powerful. The funds for political parties can be obtained through a choice of direct appropriations from the Treasury, a tax credit, or a deduction for tax purposes. Reform is essential.

And we must better understand the nature of power in our society. We have tended to shy away from the fact that economic and political power are firmly interlocked. We have accepted the assumption that every man has equal say in our democratic institutions, regardless of his economic or social status. We have denied that an uneven distribution of economic opportunity -- who goes to college -- who gets the job in the high-income profession -- affects a man's chances to exercise leadership and power.

We have been content to leave this understanding of the links between political and economic power to the ideologists of the left, or to the reactionaries of the right. Such political immaturity is intolerable. Unless we understand and master these links, we will see a further limitation of personal choice, and a grave threat to any semblance of democratic process.

The power to set economic priorities based solely on the profit motive is just as corrupting of our democratic institutions as would be the installation of unelected leaders that has marked most of man's political history.

So, this is what is demanded of us: to examine these critical interrelationships of power in our society; to rethink fearlessly the nature of American society, government, and the economy; and to cast aside obsolete, restricting attitudes. It is this open-minded approach to our beliefs, our values, our problems, that will give us a method -- a new strategy of democracy -- to carry us into the new decade. The signs are clear and demanding -- reform or perish.

The decade that has just ended -- the 1960's -- was a time of dissent, discord, and division in our society. We have been subjected to stresses and strains that few nations before us have managed to survive. And we are not finished; there is more to endure before we succeed in turning rancour into reason, and frustration into fulfillment.

But this was also a decade of discovery:

- in science, from the exploration of space to the conquering of disease; and

- in economics, which brought us nearer than before to the secret of continuing growth and prosperity.

We also discovered our weaknesses:

- the tragic face of poverty; and
- the ugly face of racism;
- the pale face of malnutrition and hunger.

We discovered that we are no longer a rural society, but an unplanned, overcrowded, industrialized and urbanized society.

But above all, in this decade, we made new discoveries of the human spirit. In the darkest period of unrest in our nation since the Civil War, we discovered that we could find ways to live together; that we could awaken the conscience of America; and that we could experience a rebirth of unselfishness, sharing, and community.

As we begin the new decade, there is a profound sense throughout America of weariness with struggle and turmoil. But we are also carrying into the 1970's a greater confidence in ourselves:

-- a confidence, not in impersonal institutions or in remote processes of government, but rather in our ability as individuals to overcome frustrations, barriers to social progress, and the personal isolation that too often accompanies urban growth. This is, above all, a spiritual development, a greater maturity in outlook and action, and a deeper sense of the importance and possibilities of individual integrity.

This is the decade in which we Americans, as a people, can come of age.

Those same problems which divided us during the 1960's can become in the 1970's a basis for a new unity of purpose, a new sense that all of us share a common destiny. We are united by the need to prevent nuclear war; the destruction of our environment; or our defeat by an impersonal and unregulated technology. But we are united even more by our growing awareness that we share the same human condition:

- racial discord of the 1960's is compelling us to find, together, ways to transform this into racial harmony;
- the dissent of a new generation of Americans is bringing us to a better understanding of the values and beliefs that have always been the real strength of America; and
- the divisions in our society growing out of poverty, deprivation, hunger, and inequality have made us aware that all of us must work together, or none of us can long prosper.

This is the legacy of our discovery.

This is what gives us hope; this is what gives us the moral strength and the spiritual courage to face an uncertain future -- not without difficulties and differences of opinion, but with a sense of common purpose, and understanding that we can prevail.

This purpose and understanding is the hallmark of the democratic strategy, that gives us confidence that democracy can serve man's needs in the 1970's and beyond. As Reinhold Niebuhr said:

"Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary."



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org